

REMARKS

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1 – 33 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, 23, 27 have been amended.

The Applicant has amended the claims to more clearly point out what the Applicant regards as the invention. Support for the amendments and additions is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally files. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, 12, 14-16, 18-21, 23, 25-29 and 31-33 under 35 USC 102(e) as being unpatentable over Mehta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0131404 A1) in view of Little et al. (U.S. Patent No. US 2002/0055852) and further in view of Leppanen (U.S. Patent no. 5,758,286). The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 6, 13, 17, 24 and 30 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mehta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0131404 A1) in view of Little et al. (U.S. Patent No. US 2002/0055852) and further in view of Larsson (U.S. Patent no. 6,304,757 B1). The Examiner has rejected claims 11 and 22 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mehta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0131404 A1) in view of Little et al. (U.S. Patent No. US 2002/0055852) and further in view of Leppanen (U.S. Patent no. 5,758,286) and further in view of Thornton (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,454B1).

The Applicant respectfully traverses. The cited references, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or render obvious all of the elements of the Applicants' claimed invention. In particular, the cited references fail to teach the element of independent claim 1 of "the service dialed number containing at least a first segment and a second segment, the first segment representing a unique code used by the mobile operator to route the call and the

second segment representing a unique code that identifies the service.” In contrast, Leppanen merely teaches a method for placing a call from a first mobile station to a second mobile station using a predetermined abbreviated dialing. The abbreviated dialing, or “short number,” is compared to a group of short numbers each having an associated public telephone number corresponding to a unique second mobile station. If a match is found, the associated public telephone number is dialed and a communication path is established between the first and the second mobile station. Therefore, the short code of Leppanen serves only one function and is only formed of one part (or segment.)

The remaining references also fail to teach the limitation of claim 1. Mehta teaches supplying applications to a subscriber of a cell phone service provider based on subscriber profiles stored by Administrator 509 if it is determined that the subscriber is authorized to download the requested applications (paragraph 138 of Mehta). Mehta fails to teach using a service dialed number selected to address the call to select a response to the call and instead relies on stored information to select a response to a request. Similar to Mehta, Larrison teaches the use of information on a subscriber stored on a memory (Col. 4 lines 33-44) to provide a response to a subscriber. Little also fails to teach selecting a response to a call based on a service dialed number selected to address the call and instead teaches locating providers of goods and services using wireless networks and providing a voice activated response, and fails to indicate how such a response is selected. Thornton teaches selecting a response to a wireless consumer based on a selection of a shopping option by the wireless consumer from a menu.

As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to teach or render obvious each of the elements of independent claim 1 for at least the reasons advanced above. The Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claims 2 – 11 depend, directly or indirectly, on claim 1. Because the cited references do not anticipate claim 1, as discussed above, the cited references do not anticipate claims 2 – 11 for at least the same reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Regarding independent claims 12, 23, and 27, the Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, either individually or in combination, do not teach or render obvious

claims 12, 23, and 27 for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 13 – 22, 24 – 26, and 28 – 33 depend upon independent claims 12, 23, and 27, respectively, and thus are also not taught or rendered obvious by the cited references. Claims 1 – 33 are currently pending. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims have overcome the Examiner's objections and rejections. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration for the application and allowance of the pending claims.

Petition for Extension of Time Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)

Applicant respectfully petitions pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) for a two month extension of time to file this response to the Office Action mailed December 14, 2005. The extended period is set to expire on February 14, 2006. A check in the amount of \$450.00 is enclosed to cover the fee for a two month extension of time.

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a)(3), applicant(s) hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 2/14, 2006



Heather M. Molleur
Reg. No. 50,432

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300